

# In the United States Court of Federal Claims

OFFICE OF SPECIAL MASTERS

No. 18-0442V

Filed: April 1, 2019

UNPUBLISHED

TIFFANY DAGEN,

Petitioner,

v.

SECRETARY OF HEALTH AND  
HUMAN SERVICES,

Respondent.

Special Processing Unit (SPU);  
Ruling on Entitlement; Concession;  
Table Injury; Influenza (Flu) and  
Tetanus Diphtheria acellular  
Pertussis (Tdap) Vaccine; Shoulder  
Injury Related to Vaccine  
Administration (SIRVA)

*Bridget Candace McCullough, Muller Brazil, LLP, Dresher, PA, for petitioner.  
Christine Mary Becer, U.S. Department of Justice, Washington, DC, for respondent.*

## RULING ON ENTITLEMENT<sup>1</sup>

**Dorsey**, Chief Special Master:

On March 26, 2018, Tiffany Dagen (“petitioner”) filed a petition for compensation under the National Vaccine Injury Compensation Program, 42 U.S.C. §300aa-10, *et seq.*<sup>2</sup> (the “Vaccine Act”). Petitioner alleges that she suffered from a left shoulder injury as a result of receiving the influenza (“flu”) vaccine and tetanus-diphtheria-acellular pertussis (“Tdap”) vaccines on February 1, 2017. Petition at 1. The case was assigned to the Special Processing Unit of the Office of Special Masters.

<sup>1</sup> The undersigned intends to post this ruling on the United States Court of Federal Claims' website. **This means the ruling will be available to anyone with access to the internet.** In accordance with Vaccine Rule 18(b), petitioner has 14 days to identify and move to redact medical or other information, the disclosure of which would constitute an unwarranted invasion of privacy. If, upon review, the undersigned agrees that the identified material fits within this definition, the undersigned will redact such material from public access. Because this unpublished ruling contains a reasoned explanation for the action in this case, undersigned is required to post it on the United States Court of Federal Claims' website in accordance with the E-Government Act of 2002. 44 U.S.C. § 3501 note (2012) (Federal Management and Promotion of Electronic Government Services).

<sup>2</sup> National Childhood Vaccine Injury Act of 1986, Pub. L. No. 99-660, 100 Stat. 3755. Hereinafter, for ease of citation, all “§” references to the Vaccine Act will be to the pertinent subparagraph of 42 U.S.C. § 300aa (2012).

On April 1, 2019, respondent filed his Rule 4(c) report in which he concedes that petitioner is entitled to compensation in this case. Respondent's Rule 4(c) Report at 1. Specifically, respondent states that petitioner's claim meets the Table criteria for a shoulder injury related to vaccine administration ("SIRVA"). *Id.* at 3. Respondent further agrees that "petitioner had no history of pain, inflammation or dysfunction of the affected shoulder prior to intramuscular vaccine administration that would explain the alleged signs, symptoms, examination findings, and/or diagnostic studies occurring after vaccine injection; she suffered the onset of pain within forty-eight hours of vaccine administration; her pain and reduced range of motion were limited to the shoulder in which the intramuscular vaccine was administered; and there is no other condition or abnormality present that would explain petitioner's symptoms. Therefore, petitioner is entitled to a presumption of vaccine causation." *Id.*

Respondent further states that "[w]ith respect to other statutory and jurisdictional issues, the records show that the case was timely filed, that the vaccine was received in the United States, and that petitioner satisfies the statutory severity requirement by suffering the residual effects or complications of her injury for more than six months after vaccine administration. See 42 U.S.C. §§ 300aa-11(c)(1)(D)(i). Petitioner avers that no civil action or proceedings have been pursued in connection with the vaccine-related injury. See 42 U.S.C. §§ 300aa-11(a)(5) and -11(c)(1)(E); Ex. 9. Thus, in light of the information contained in petitioner's medical records and affidavit, respondent concedes that entitlement to compensation is appropriate under the terms of the Vaccine Act, and will focus resources on determining the amount of compensation to be provided to petitioner in accordance with the terms and conditions of the Vaccine Act." Respondent's Rule 4(c) Report at 4.

**In view of respondent's position and the evidence of record, the undersigned finds that petitioner is entitled to compensation.**

**IT IS SO ORDERED.**

**s/Nora Beth Dorsey**  
Nora Beth Dorsey  
Chief Special Master